

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/765,642	YABLOKO, LEONID	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thu-Nguyet Le	2162	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Thu-Nguyet Le (Examiner). (3) Clark Jablon (Applicant's Representative).
 (2) Khanh Pham (Primary Examiner). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 19 November 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Ogasawara (US 2001/0018671).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



**KHANH B. PHAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants' representative provided details of claim 1 and argued that Ogasawara does not teach "connecting the tuples to represent sequential events of the one or more processes". The examiners refer applicants' representative to the process of ordering merchandise, in which the sequence of items are picked to construct a shopping list. The examiner suggested applicants' representative should further amend the claim to include details limitation. Additionally, the examiners agree to drop specification objection and 101 rejection made in the previous Non-Final Rejection .